UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,405	11/30/2004	Wolfgang Demmer	9013.0099	2828
Attn: Dennis E. Stenzel, Esq. Chernoff, Vilhauer, McClung & Stenzel, LLP Suite 1600 601 S.W. Second Avenue Portland, OR 97204-3157			EXAMINER	
			FERNANDEZ, SUSAN EMILY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1651	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/14/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/516,405	DEMMER ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	SUSAN E. FERNANDEZ	1651			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 N 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under N	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 11,14 and 15 is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 11,14 and 15 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct should be considered to by the Example 11).	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

The amendments filed May 11, 2009, and June 15, 2009, have been received and entered.

Claims 1-10, 12, 13, and 16 are cancelled. Claims 11, 14, and 15 are pending and examined on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 11, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grano et al. (International Journal of Artificial Organs, 2002, 25(4): 297-305) in view of Sugo et al. (US 5,071,880), Sigma Aldrich (http://www.sigmaaldrich.com, accessed on 9/3/09 and 9/9/09), Chemical Book (http://www.chemicalbook.com, accessed on 9/3/09), Organische

Application/Control Number: 10/516,405

Art Unit: 1651

Chemie (Carey et al., 1995, Plenum Publishing Corporation, page 1390), Advanced Organic Chemistry (March, J., 3rd edition, 1985, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., page 369), and Burtin et al. (US 6,248,238).

Grano et al. discloses a membrane loaded with antiproteases for reducing the active protease blood concentration (abstract), wherein a protease/antiprotease complex is formed upon contacting the membrane with a solution containing proteases (page 298, first column, first paragraph). An antitrypsin is immobilized via diazotization occurring through tyrosine residues (page 299, first column, first full paragraph and Figure 1). Thus, the protease inhibitor (antitrypsin) is coupled to the membrane body via functional groups, where nonionic chemical bonding occurs. Further still, it is noted that trypsin is a serine protease (page 300, second column, second paragraph under "Results").

Grano et al. does not expressly disclose that the antiprotease loaded on the membrane is pepstatin, bestatin, diprotin, antipain, chymostatin, leupeptin, E64, TLCK, or paminobenzamidine, where the antiprotease is chemically coupled to epoxy groups of the membrane which is epoxy-functionalized and microporous.

It is noted that Grano et al. teaches that the membrane for loading with antiproteases is grafted with glycidyl methacrylate (page 298, first column, last sentence). This membrane is a "Supor" R/polyGMA membrane (page 293, second column, fourth full paragraph).

Sugo et al. teaches that glycidyl methacrylate is an epoxy-containing polymerizable monomer (column 3, lines 29-31 and column 1, line 67 through column 2, line 1).

The references Sigma Aldrich and Chemical Book demonstrate that the protease inhibitors recited in instant claim 11 have primary and/or secondary amine groups.

Art Unit: 1651

Organische Chemie and Advanced Organic Chemistry demonstrate that primary and secondary amine groups react with epoxy groups to chemically couple the respective moieties containing the epoxy and amine groups.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have used the Grano "Supor" R/polyGMA membrane to bind protease inhibitors, including pepstatin, bestatin, diprotin, antipain, chymostatin, leupeptin, E64, TLCK, and p-aminobenzamidine, when practicing the Grano invention in order to serve the purpose of the Grano invention to reduce protease concentrations. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to have removed a variety of proteases, or to have ensured that a specific protease is indeed removed. There would have been a reasonable expectation of success that the Grano membrane would have bound to those protease inhibitors since those protease inhibitors have amine groups which would have chemically coupled to the epoxy groups known to be present in the glycidyl methacrylate grafted on the Grano membranes.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have used different compounds as the protease inhibitors present in the membranes of the device, where the different compounds may be present in different membranes and/or combined with other protease inhibitors in the same membrane. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to have separated a variety of proteases from a solution, or to have ensured that a specific protease is indeed separated from a solution. It would have been obvious to have used compounds recognized in the art as protease inhibitors, including those recited in instant claim 11, in the device, as Grano et al. does not limit the protease inhibitor included in its membranes.

Art Unit: 1651

Grano et al. also differs from the claimed invention in that it does not expressly disclose a device having a housing with a fluid inlet and a fluid outlet comprising a plurality of membranes.

Burtin et al. discloses a medical apparatus for the extracorporeal treatment of blood or plasma, comprising a semi-permeable membrane with protease inhibitors (column 4, lines 34-36). The apparatus clearly comprises a housing having a fluid inlet and a fluid outlet (see Figure 5).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have used the Grano membranes in a series in a medical apparatus for the extracorporeal treatment of blood. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since Burtin et al. demonstrates that protease inhibitors on membranes in a housing with a fluid inlet and a fluid outlet is suitable for treatment of blood. Further more, the use of multiple membranes in a series would have ensured thorough reduction of the active protease blood concentration. Thus, instant claims 11, 14, and 15 are rendered obvious.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed May 11, 2009 and June 15, 2009, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant asserts that it is well known that primary and secondary amine groups react with epoxy groups to chemically couple the respective moieties containing the epoxy and amine groups. Given the evidence provided by the applicant, the Organische Chemie and Advanced Organic Chemistry references have been introduced in the rejection along with the teaching that the Grano invention provides a membrane with epoxy groups.

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUSAN E. FERNANDEZ whose telephone number is (571)272-

3444. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Mike Wityshyn can be reached on (571) 272-0926. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Leon B Lankford/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1651

Susan E. Fernandez

Page 6

Examiner

Art Unit 1651

sef